

REMARKS

Certain claims have been amended, support for which can be found throughout the specification and in the claims as originally filed. The amendments to the claims do not add prohibited new matter. Claims 19, 25, 29-36, 38 and 40-45 are stated to be allowed on page 2 of the Office Action.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

Claims 20-22, 24, 28, 37 and 39 were rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph for allegedly failing to further limit the subject matter of the claim upon which they depend for the reasons set out beginning on page 2 of the Office Action.

The Office Action alleges that claim 19 requires that X_0 be equal to one and that recitation of X_0 equal to 0 or 1 in the dependent claims does not limit the claims further. Applicants respectfully disagree. Claim 19 recites that X_0 is present in the amount defined by x_0 , and that x_0 is equal to 0 or 1. Accordingly, the dependent claims properly include all the limitations of the claim upon which they depend and it is accordingly respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Conclusion

The foregoing amendments and remarks are being made to place the application in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request entry of the amendments, reconsideration and the timely allowance of the pending claims. A favorable action is awaited. Should the Examiner find that an interview would be helpful to further prosecution of this application, she is invited to telephone the undersigned at their convenience.

Dated: **January 10, 2012**
Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP
Customer No. **09629**
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
202-739-3000

Respectfully submitted,
Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP

/Zachary Derbyshire/

Zachary E. Derbyshire, Ph.D.
Registration No. 64,669